



On the codimension-one foliation theorem of W. Thurston

Francois Laudenbach

► To cite this version:

Francois Laudenbach. On the codimension-one foliation theorem of W. Thurston. 2007. hal-00095915v2

HAL Id: hal-00095915

<https://hal.science/hal-00095915v2>

Preprint submitted on 8 Jan 2007

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

ON THE CODIMENSION-ONE FOLIATION THEOREM OF W. THURSTON

FRANÇOIS LAUDENBACH

ABSTRACT. This article has been withdrawn due to a mistake which is explained in version 2.

We consider a 3-simplex σ in an affine space E . Let x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 be its vertices; the edges are oriented by the ordering of the vertices. Let F_i be the 2-face opposite to x_i . We are looking at germs of codimension-one foliation along σ (or along a subcomplex of σ) which are transversal to σ and to all its faces of positive dimension.

If such a foliation \mathcal{H} is given along the three 2-faces F_2, F_3, F_4 through x_1 and if \mathcal{H} does not trace spiralling leaves on $F_2 \cup F_3 \cup F_4$, then \mathcal{H} extends to σ transversally to F_1 . If \mathcal{H} is only given along $F_2 \cup F_4$ (resp. $F_3 \cup F_4$), then \mathcal{H} extends to F_3 (resp. F_2) with no spiralling on $F_2 \cup F_3 \cup F_4$, and hence to σ .

But, on contrary of what is claimed on version 1 of this paper, it is in general not true when \mathcal{H} is given along $F_2 \cup F_3$. It is only true when an extra condition is fulfilled: *The separatrices of x_2 in F_3 and of x_3 in F_2 cross $F_2 \cap F_3 = [x_1, x_4]$ respectively at points y_2 and y_3 which lie in the order $y_2 < y_3$.*

The first place where this extension argument is misused is corollary 4.5. Moreover the statement of this corollary is wrong. Let us explain why.

Let $\sigma^{pl} \subset E$ be a so-called *pleated* 3-simplex associated to σ and \mathcal{H} be a germ of codimension-one foliation transversal to its simplices. We recall that σ^{pl} and σ have the same boundary and we assume that \mathcal{H} traces spiralling leaves on $\partial\sigma$, making the pleating necessary according to the Reeb stability theorem. Let $x * \sigma^{pl}$ be the (abstract) cone on σ^{pl} . If $\dim E$ is large enough, it embeds into E . Certainly \mathcal{H} does not extend to $x * \sigma^{pl}$, contradicting the statement of corollary 4.5. Indeed, if it does, then we get a foliation of $x * \partial\sigma^{pl} = x * \partial\sigma$ transversal to all faces. Proposition 4.4 states that, if all 3-faces through x in the 4-simplex $x * \sigma$ are foliated, then the foliation extends to the face opposite to x , which is σ itself. But this is impossible due to the spiralling leaves on $\partial\sigma$.

LABORATOIRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES JEAN LERAY, UMR 6629 DU CNRS, FACULTÉ DES SCIENCES ET TECHNIQUES UNIVERSITÉ DE NANTES, 2, RUE DE LA HOUSSINIÈRE, F-44322 NANTES CEDEX 3, FRANCE
E-mail address: Francois.Laudenbach@univ-nantes.fr

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 57R30.

Key words and phrases. Foliations, Γ -structures, transverse geometry.